arXiv:1610.00406v2 [astro-ph.CO] 1 Dec 2016

O' R Inflation in F-term Supergravity

Sibo Zheng[1]

[1] *Department of Physics, Chongqing University, Chongqing 401331, P. R. China*

(Dated: October, 2016)

The supersymmetric realization of inflation in F-term supergravity is usually plagued by the well known "η" problem. In this paper, a broad class of small-field examples is realized by employing general O' Raifeartaigh superpotentials. For illustration we present the simplest example in detail, which can be considered as a generalization of hybrid inflation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Inflation is an extensively studied and widely accepted scenario to solve both the flatness and horizon problems in the early Universe. For a review, see, e.g. [1]. On the other hand, Supersymmetry (SUSY) is a scenario to deal with the divergent problem of Standard Model Higgs mass, which is inferred to probably play an important role in the high energy region (far above the weak scale) from both the null results at particle colliders (e.g., LHC) as well as dark matter direct detection experiments (e.g., LUX). Therefore, it is natural to ask the question whether inflation and SUSY are connected.

When we explore high energy physics near the Planck mass scale m_P, gravitational effect has to be taken into account. This implies that one should discuss the realization of such kind of inflation in the context of Supergravity. Given the structure of potential $V_{\rm local} = V^F_{\rm local} + V^D_{\rm local}$ in supergravity, studies on the SUSY realizations of inflation can be divided into two classes - the F-term and D-term supergravity. In the former one, in unit of Planck mass

$$V^F_{\rm local} = e^K \left[D_i W K^{-1}_{ij^*} D_{j^*} W^* - 3 \mid W \mid^2 \right] \tag{1}$$

where $K(\Phi_i)$ and $W(\Phi_i)$ is the Kahler and superpotential, respectively, and covariant derivative $D_i W = \partial_i W + K_i W$, with index i referring to a chiral superfield Φ_i. The expotential factor e^K introduces the well known "η" problem to F-term Supergravity. For reviews, see, e.g, [2, 3]. Progresses along this line are significantly improved by Kallosh *et al* [4], where the authors gave a prescription to construct a general potential of inflation, but with the price of some specific shift symmetry as required in the Kahler potential.

There is no such "η" problem in D-term supergravity [5]. Along this line, it was firstly proposed by Halyo [6] that a positive and non-zero D-term naturally realizes inflation. Unfortunately, by following the insights in [7], the Fayet-Iliopoulos term itself is not consistent with the supergravity.

In this paper, we focus on the realization of inflation in F-term supergravity. Unlike in [4], we turn to canonical Kahler potential without any specific shift symmetry. In order to keep our calculations perturbatively valid, we restrict to the small-field inflation[1]. Previous studies under these same assumptions in the literature include hybrid inflation [10], new inflation [11] and single-field inflation [12].

[1] For examples of the large-field inflation such as chaotic inflation, see, e.g., [8, 9].

The plan of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II we give a prescription to construct a general superpotential without the η problem for canonical Kahler potential. We find that it is actually valid for O' Raifeartaigh (O' R) superpotential. In Sec.III we present a new example with the simplest O' R superpotential for illustration. This model obviously differs from the hybrid inflation in the sense that there is no tachyon mass problem, although it gives rise to a spectral index similar to the hybrid inflation. Finally, we conclude in Sec.IV.

II. O' R SUPERPOTENTIAL WITHOUT η PROBLEM

This section is devoted to a prescription, from which there is no η problem for a renormalizable superpotential W and canonical Kahler potential K. In order to provide inflation the potential V in Eq.(1) must be positive and non-zero. Consider that for the small-field inflation the local potential is well approximated to

$$V^F_{\rm local} \approx V^F_{\rm global} + \mathcal{O}(1/m_P^2). \tag{2}$$

This requirement is equivalent to that the global SUSY should be broken $\mid F_i \mid^2 \neq 0$. Meanwhile, the inflaton mass should be always small [13, 14] (in compared with the Hubble parameter H) in order to evade the η problem, and the others scalars' masses should be comparable with H if one considers a realization of single-field inflation [2]. This requirement is equivalent to that there exists a flat direction with the modulus identified as the inflaton superfield X.

In the global version of SUSY the two requirements above can be satisfied simultaneously by choosing general O' R superpotential,

$$W(X, \chi_i) = X(\mu^2 + f(\chi_i)) + g(\chi_i), \tag{3}$$

where X and χ_i are chiral superfields, and functions $f(\chi_i)$ and $g(\chi_i)$ are defined as [3],

$$\begin{aligned} f(\chi_i) &= a_{ij}\chi_i\chi_j, \\ g(\chi_i) &= b_{ij}\chi_i\chi_j + b_{ijk}\chi_i\chi_j\chi_k. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

[2] Note that $H^2 \approx V_{\rm global}/3$ in unit of Planck mass.

[3] In principle, linear terms like $a_i\chi_i$ and $b_i\chi_i$ may appear in $f(\chi_i)$ and $g(\chi_i)$, respectively. However, the former probably introduce dangerous mixing between X and χ_i, and the later introduce new linear structure except X in the superpotential. These terms can be forbidden by adjusting their R charges.

The coefficients a_{ij}, b_{ij}, etc, are assumed to be real for simplicity, and μ is the SUSY breaking scale. The superpotential is only linear function of X, from which with suitable R charge assignments the minimal value of V is determined by [15],

$$F_X \mid_{\langle\chi_i\rangle} = \mu^2, \quad F_{\chi_i} \mid_{\langle\chi_i\rangle} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad X \text{ arbitrary} \tag{5}$$

Now, let us examine whether there is indeed no η problem in the local version in Eq.(1) for superpotential in Eq.(3) with the structure of vacuum in Eq.(5). After a detailed calculation we find that [4],

$$V^F_{\rm local} = e^K \cdot \left\{ A_0 + [A_1 X + h.c] + A_2 \mid X \mid^2 + [A_3 X \mid X \mid^2 + h.c] + A_4 \mid X \mid^4 \right\}, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0 &= \mid F_X \mid^2 + \mid F_{\chi_i} \mid^2 + \mid g \mid^2 (\mid \chi_i \mid^2 - 3) + [g^* F_{\chi_i} \chi_i + h.c] \\
A_1 &= \left(F^*_{\chi_i} \chi^*_i + g^* \mid \chi_i \mid^2 - 2 g^* \right) F_X \\
A_2 &= - \mid F_X \mid^2 + \mid F_X \mid^2 \mid \chi_i \mid^2 + \mid g \mid^2 \\
A_3 &= g^* F_X \\
A_4 &= \mid F_X \mid^4 .
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Eq.(6) is organized in powers of X, the benefit of which is that the terms of mass squared for X can be easily extracted from individual terms in Eq.(6) after one expands the expotential factor $e^K \approx 1 + \mid X \mid^2 + \mid \chi_i \mid^2$.

Under the small-field approximation ($\mid X \mid << 1$ etc.) we obtain the final expression for $V^F_{\rm local}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
V^F_{\rm local} \approx \tilde{A}_0 &+ [\tilde{A}_1 X + h.c] + \tilde{A}_2 \mid X \mid^2 + [\tilde{A}_3 X \mid X \mid^2 + h.c] + \tilde{A}_4 \mid X \mid^4 \\
&+ [\tilde{A}_5 X \mid X \mid^4 + h.c] + \tilde{A}_6 \mid X \mid^6 + \cdots
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where we have ignored higher-dimensional operators suppressed by m_P. Here, functions $\tilde{A}_i$ are given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{A}_0 = (1 + \mid \chi_i \mid^2) A_0, \qquad \tilde{A}_1 = (1 + \mid \chi_i \mid^2) A_1 \\
&\tilde{A}_2 = A_0 + (1 + \mid \chi_i \mid^2) A_2, \quad \tilde{A}_3 = A_1 + (1 + \mid \chi_i \mid^2) A_3 \\
&\tilde{A}_4 = A_2 + (1 + \mid \chi_i \mid^2) A_4, \quad \tilde{A}_5 = A_3, \quad \tilde{A}_6 = A_4
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

[4] Keep in mind that operators with mass dimensions higher than 4 are compensated by the correct powers of Planck mass.

From Eq.(8) the mass squared m_X^2 is read as,

$$m_X^2 = \left[\mid F_X \mid^2 + \cdots\right] + (1 + \cdots)\left[- \mid F_X \mid^2 + \cdots\right] + \mathcal{O}(\mid X \mid /m_P) \tag{10}$$

where we have used $F_X \mid_{\langle\chi_i\rangle} = \mu^2$ and $\cdots$ represent contributions from high-dimensional operators. Clearly, $m_X^2 = 0$ at the leading order, and its smallness in compared with H^2 still holds as long as we restrict to the small-field inflation.

One may also verify that all the masses squared for χ_i are of order H^2 from $\tilde{A}_0$ in Eq.(9) and Eq.(7). It results from the fact that there is only one non-zero F-term in the minimal of V.

In summary, for small-field approximation our statements about masses for X and χ_i are always true as long as the mass scales of coefficients a_{ij}, b_{ij}, etc, in Eq.(4) are all of the order μ for O' R superpotential. In the light of our results it is easy to understand why there is no η problem in some simple inflation models such as hybrid inflation ($g = 0$, $f = \bar{\chi}\chi$) in the literature. We refer this broad class of small-field inflation models as O' R inflation.

III. AN EXAMPLE

By following the results in the previous section, in this section we propose a concrete and simple example for illustration. As we will see, this new inflation model obviously differs from the hybrid inflation in the sense that there is no tachyon mass problem, although it gives rises to a similar spectral index.

A. Inflaton effective potential

We begin with the simplest O' R model [16] in the class of superpotentials defined in Eq.(3),

$$W = X(\mu^2 + \frac{1}{2}h\chi_1^2) + m\chi_1\chi_2. \tag{11}$$

In this model the SUSY-breaking vacuum is described by $\chi_{1,2} = 0$ and arbitrary X, and $V^F_{\rm global} = \mid F_X \mid^2 = \mu^4$. By substituting $\langle f\rangle \mid_{\chi_{1,2}=0} = \langle g\rangle \mid_{\chi_{1,2}=0} = 0$ into Eq.(8) one can verify that $m_X = 0$. So, X is the candidate of inflaton.

In order to derive the effective potential for X we firstly calculate the mass spectral for the chiral superfields $\chi_{1,2}$. By virtue of the standard formulas, the scalar masses squared

$\mathcal{M}_B^2$ and the fermion masses squared $\mathcal{M}_F^2$ are given by, respectively,

$$\mathcal{M}_B^2 = m^2 \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mid \epsilon_X \mid^2 +1 & \epsilon_X & \epsilon_\mu & 0 \\ \epsilon_X^* & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \epsilon_\mu & 0 & \mid \epsilon_X \mid^2 +1 & \epsilon_X^* \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon_X & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{12}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_F^2 = m^2 \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mid \epsilon_X \mid^2 +1 & \epsilon_X & 0 & 0 \\ \epsilon_X^* & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mid \epsilon_X \mid^2 +1 & \epsilon_X^* \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon_X & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

where $\epsilon_X = h \mid X \mid /m$ and $\epsilon_\mu = h\mu^2/m^2$.

If we simply assume m is of order μ [5], then ϵ_X can be far larger than unity while ϵ_μ is of order one for the Yukawa coupling constant $h \sim 0.1$. In this case the signs of determinant of $\mathcal{M}_B^2$ in Eq.(12) and $\mathcal{M}_F^2$ in Eq.(13) are both positive, which indicates that there is no tachyon mass problem in this O' R model. Substituting the mass eigenvalues of $\mathcal{M}_{B,F}^2$ into the Coleman-Weinberg potential, we obtain the final expression for the inflaton ($\sigma =\mid X \mid$) effective potential,

$$V_{\rm eff}(\sigma) = \mu^4 \left[1 + \frac{h^2}{16\pi^2} \log \left(\frac{h\sigma}{\Lambda} \right) + \cdots \right]. \tag{14}$$

Here, Λ denotes the renormalizable scale in this model, and we have ignored non-renormalizable term which is only important for inflation parameters as discussed below when $h > 0.2$.

B. Fit to inflationary parameters

Now we discuss the implications in the simplest O' R inflation model. At first, we count the total number of e-folds during inflation,

$$N_{tot} = \int_{\sigma_e}^{\sigma_i} \frac{V}{V'} d\sigma \simeq \frac{8\pi^2}{h^2} \sigma_i^2 \tag{15}$$

[5] Note that the magnitude of μ is constrained by the scalar amplitude $\mathcal{R}_s$ to be typically of order 10^{-5} in unit of Planck mass.

where σ_i and σ_e is the initial and end value of inflaton (in unit of Planck mass), respectively. In Eq.(15) we have used the approximation $\sigma_e << \sigma_i << 1$ for small-field inflation. Secondly, the slow roll parameters in this model are given by,

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{V'}{V}\right)^2 = \frac{h^2}{64\pi^2 N}, \qquad \eta = \frac{V''}{V} = -\frac{1}{2N}, \tag{16}$$

where N is the e-fold number corresponding to the inflaton value $\sigma_N = \sqrt{Nh^2/8\pi^2}$ during inflation. From Eq.(16) one finds that the magnitude of $\mid \epsilon \mid$ is small in comparison with $\mid \eta \mid$ due to the one-loop factor suppression.



FIG. 1. Parameter space in the plane of $h - N$. the curves of r and n_s are shown in green and red, respectively. Only Regions between the right-hand side of the red line $n_s = 0.98$ and left-hand side of the red line $n_s = 0.982$ are allowed.

In terms of the slow roll parameters in Eq.(16) the main inflationary parameters measured by experiments are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} n_s &= 1 - 6\epsilon + 2\eta \simeq 1 - \frac{1}{N}, \\ \frac{dn_s}{d\ln\,\mathrm{k}} &\simeq 16\epsilon\eta - 24\epsilon^2 \simeq -\frac{h^2}{8\pi^2 N^2}, \\ r &= 16\epsilon \simeq \frac{h^2}{4\pi^2 N}, \\ \mathcal{R}_s &= \frac{1}{24\pi^2}\frac{V}{\epsilon} \simeq \frac{8\mu^4 N}{3h^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where n_s is the spectral index, $dn_s/d\ln$ k is the running, r is the tensor-to-scalar ratio, and $\mathcal{R}_s$ is the amplitude of primordial fluctuations. In fig.1 we show the parameter space by fitting to the experimental constraints on the inflationary parameters in Table.I. It shows that only regions between the right-hand side of the solid red line $n_s = 0.98$ and left-hand side of the dotted red line $n_s = 0.982$ are allowed.

	ΛCDM+r+nrun
n_s	0.9721 ± 0.011 (68% CL)
$\frac{dn_s}{dlnk}$	-0.0038 ± 0.0068 (68% CL)
$r_{0.01}$	≤ 0.075 (95% CL)
$\ln(10^{10}\mathcal{R}_s)$	3.117 ± 0.021 (68% CL)

TABLE I. The latest experimental limits at 68% CL on the inflationary parameters in the cosmological model ΛCDM+r+nrun from $P15 + BK14 + BAO15$ data combination [17].

We would like to stress on the magnitude of h for above analysis. Firstly, it is constrained by the requirement that $\sigma_N << 1$, which leads to $h << \min(\sqrt{8\pi^2/N}) \sim 1.25$ for $N = 60$, On the other hand, the requirement of non-renormalizable contribution to Eq.(8) is subdominant in compared with the Coleman-Weinberg contribution leads to $h < 0.2$.

Also, we would like to mention that the spectral index in this model is actually independent of h and mainly sensitive to the total number of e-folds during inflation. Typically, we have $n_s \sim 0.98$, $r \sim 10^{-6}$ and $dn_s/d\ln$ k $\sim 10^{-7}$. It is likely to tune the value of n_s from the expectation value of hybrid inflation (~ 0.98) to the favored value of Planck data (~ 0.974 [19]) by taking the effects of reheating into account. See, e.g., [18]. This issue is beyond the scope of this paper.

IV. CONCLUSION

A prescription to construct a general superpotential without the η problem for canonical Kahler potential has been addressed in the F-term supergravity. We have verified that it is valid for a O' R superpotential at least for the small-field inflation. Also, the simplest O' R model is studied in detail for illustration, which is found to be similar to the hybrid inflation. Since there is no tachyon mass problem in this example, it can be considered as a

generalization of hybrid inflation.

Although it is not a concrete statement, the constraint on the spectral index in the simplest O' R model may be relaxed in some non-minimal examples. Discussions along this line will be interesting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No.11405015.

[1] D. Baumann, arXiv:0907.5424 [hep-th].

[2] D. H. Lyth and A. Riotto, Phys. Rept. **314**, 1 (1999), [hep-ph/9807278].

[3] M. Yamaguchi, Class. Quant. Grav. **28**, 103001 (2011), arXiv:1101.2488 [astro-ph.CO].

[4] R. Kallosh, A. Linde and T. Rube, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 043507 (2011), arXiv:1011.5945 [hep-th].

[5] E. D. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 6847 (1995), [hep-ph/9405389].

[6] E. Halyo, Phys. Lett. B **387**, 43 (1996), [hep-ph/9606423].

[7] Z. Komargodski and N. Seiberg, JHEP **0906**, 007 (2009), arXiv:0904.1159 [hep-th].

[8] M. Kawasaki, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3572 (2000), [hep-ph/0004243].

[9] R. Kallosh and A. Linde, JCAP **1011**, 011 (2010), arXiv:1008.3375 [hep-th].

[10] A. D. Linde and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. D **56**, R1841 (1997), [hep-ph/9703209].

[11] K.-I. Izawa and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **393**, 331 (1997), [hep-ph/9608359].

[12] H. Bernardo and H. Nastase, JHEP **1609**, 071 (2016), arXiv:1605.01934 [hep-th].

[13] E. J. Copeland, A. R. Liddle, D. H. Lyth, E. D. Stewart and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 6410 (1994), [astro-ph/9401011].

[14] D. Roest, M. Scalisi and I. Zavala, JCAP **1311**, 007 (2013), arXiv:1307.4343 [hep-th].

[15] D. Shih, JHEP **0802**, 091 (2008), [hep-th/0703196].

[16] L. O' Raifeartaigh, Nucl. Phys. B **96**, 331 (1975).

[17] Q. G. Huang, K. Wang and S. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 10, 103516 (2016), arXiv:1512.07769 [astro-ph.CO].

[18] K. Dimopoulos and C. Owen, arXiv:1606.06677 [hep-ph].

[19] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO].